



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

### III.—SOME IRREGULAR FORMS OF THE ELEGIAC DISTICH.

The elegiac distich consists, in its regular form, of four dactylic cola; two tripodies, uniting in the usual way to form an hexameter, followed by two catalectic tripodies uniting, according to rules of their own, to form the so-called pentameter.<sup>1</sup> The independence of the elegiac hexameter is clearly indicated by hiatus and syllaba anceps.<sup>2</sup> Exceptions are very rare. Gleditsch, l. c., quotes Simonides, 120 (Cr.) for the division of a word between the two lines of the distich. The word, however, is a proper name, the epigram an *ἀνάθημα* and bracketed by Crusius.<sup>3</sup> At any rate this license must have been as uncommon as the same thing in ottava rima.<sup>4</sup>

In the pentameter, both Latin and Greek, the rule that the two dactyls of the second hemistich must be kept pure is practically unbroken. Exceptions to the rule of diaeresis between the two hemistichs are also very rare. Hephaestion, p. 53, W., quotes:

Ἰερά, νῦν δὲ Διοσκουρίδew γενεή (Kallim. 192, Schn.)

It will be observed that the word here is a compound proper name and that the pause occurs between the parts<sup>5</sup>. Euripides,

<sup>1</sup> Everyone now is aware that "pentameter" is a misnomer. The verse has six feet, not five. The word, however, is not only convenient but was a common designation of it as early as Hermesianax. See Athenaeus XIII, 598, A and Weil, *JJ*, 1865, p. 655. But see G. Schultz, *Hermes* 35, pp. 308 ff.

<sup>2</sup> See Christ, *Metrik der Griechen und Römer*, par. 245 and ref., H. Gleditsch, par. 38 (Müller's *Handb.*, vol. II), Rossbach and Westphal<sup>3</sup>, III 2, p. 80.

<sup>3</sup> Two other cases are quoted by Rossbach, l. c.

<sup>4</sup> Ariosto 41, 32, 1-2; 43, 105, 3-4, both compound words, are the only cases in the *Orl. Furioso* (4832 stanzas). 42, 14, 3 should not be included since the device is meant to represent the last word (a compound proper name) of Brandimarte cut short by death. No cases occur in Boiardo or in Tasso's *Ger. Lib.* The effect of this device in English is comic. Comp. Canning's famous song, "Eleven Years in Prison," and Saxe's "Rhyme of the Rail."

<sup>5</sup> Christ, 244, cites another verse from Mar. Victorinus, 2561. But comp. the remarks of Victorinus himself and the text of Schneider, Kallim. *Frag.* Anon. 392, Hiller-Cr., *Frag. eleg. adesp.* 13, and Bergk, *Frag. adesp.* 13.

*Kyklops*, 74, generally quoted by writers on metric, is without this excuse. But I shall discuss the line later.

Even elision between the two hemistichs of the pentameter, which is not especially infrequent in Greek, is very rare in Latin.

But, on the other hand, the unity of the pentameter, the strict conception of it as a single verse, is emphasized, in Latin, by the avoidance of hiatus between hemistichs and, in both Latin and Greek, by the avoidance of a short syllable at the end of the first hemistich.<sup>1</sup>

It is a commonplace of criticism that the distich is capable of reproducing practically every tone and semi-tone in the gamut of human feeling. The truth of Schiller's famous description has been strenuously attacked but, at all events, the pentameter stands for the emotional side of the combination. In these brief hemistichs and, particularly, in the abrupt medial catalexis the imaginative reader may perhaps be pardoned for finding, by turns, the pause which points the preacher's moral or precedes the sting of the epigram, the sob which chokes the song of the bereaved, the cry to arms, the hiccup that tells of dining not wisely, the incoherence of the happy lover or, again, the sigh of one who knows too well that to him neither youth nor beauty nor happy love shall ever come again.

So it came to pass that the distich was found equally suitable whether wrought to the temper and genius of Archilochos, the war-songs of Kallinos and Tyrtaios, the laments of Mimnermos, the politics and moral saws of Solon and Theognis, or the literary epigrams of Simonides and the long line of his distinguished successors. Euripides, *Androm.* 103 f. appears to anticipate the Alexandrian elegists in their return to the old Ionian type of Mimnermos. I find no other cases in the drama. With the Alexandrians the use of the distich was varied and extensive. Through them it reached the Romans. Here it was perfected for the epigram by Catullus and Martial, and for the elegy by Gallus, Tibullus, Propertius and Ovid.

During the last twenty or thirty years much minute and searching study has been devoted to the technical art of the elegiac distich in its regular form, and we are gradually being lifted to a

<sup>1</sup> It was held by some metricians under the Empire that—in accord with their theory of origins—this syllable might be short. But even in later times we find few traces of its occurrence. See Christ, p. 207; Rossbach, l. c., p. 81.

more intelligent conception of the grace and delicacy as well as the versatility and power of a form which, with the single exception of the hexameter itself, may claim to be at once the most artistic, the oldest, the most widely used, and the longest to live, of all the metrical forms of classical antiquity.

When one considers the long life and popularity of the distich as well as the variety of talent still represented in what remains of it, the permanence of the regular form is remarkable. Radical deviations are rare, although a complete survey of literature and inscriptions for a dozen or more centuries reveals a number large enough to deserve more attention than hitherto seems to have been given them. Christ and Rossbach, in their excellent works, have devoted as much attention to them as could be expected in practical hand-books. Usener, in his thoughtful and convincing *Altgriechischer Versbau* has pointed out and explained the importance of some of these deviations on the side of metre in its historical development. Otherwise I find very little reference to the subject besides an editorial comment here and there, which usually begins and ends with the mere citation of a parallel or two and the observation that such forms are characteristic of uneducated people. That the ancient metricians did nothing with the subject is not surprising. Their purpose was to describe not so much how the distich had been written as how it should be written. Hence their chief concern was the normal type as presented by the great masters.<sup>1</sup>

While accepting in full the views of Usener regarding the ultimate origin of these forms it has seemed to me that some of them deserve a more detailed examination of their sphere and character. They betray, if not an artistic, at least a conscious, theory of composition that should partly account for their survival to the latest times. Moreover, it is certain that, in some cases, their authors are beyond the suspicion of either ignorance or inability.<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> See Rossbach, l. c., p. 81, for references to the ancient metricians on this subject.

The preliminary collection of material, which would otherwise be very tedious, is much simplified by the fact that not only certain bulky departments, like the epic, may be passed over at once, but that the vast field of inscriptions has already been gleaned for all poetical forms by Kaibel, *Carmina ex lapidibus collecta*, etc., 1878, and by Buecheler, *Carmina Epigraphica*, 1898. See also F. D. Allen, *Papers of the Amer. School at Athens*, IV (1888),

## I.

Those cases in which the pentameter occurs outside of the distich and is not associated with the hexameter. These may be classed as :

A. The use of the pentameter with verses other than the hexameter.

B. The use of the pentameter as a monostich.

C. The use of the pentameter *κατὰ στίχον*.

A. The pentameter with verses other than the hexameter.

Under this head the most noteworthy examples are the "dramatic pentameters" mentioned by Christ, p. 211, Gleditsch, p. 718, and others. A rapid survey of the Greek drama, including the fragments found in the editions of Koch, Kaibel and Nauck, reveals the following cases. For purposes of discussion, I quote them in full :

Aischylos, *Suppl.* 541-2,

οἷστρον ἔρεσσομένα  
φεύγει ἀμαρτίνοος

= 550-1,

Λύδιά τ' <ἀγ> γύαλα  
καὶ δι' ὁρῶν Κιλικῶν

*Agam.* 1005,

καὶ πότμος εὐθυπορῶν  
(second half lost)

= 1022-3,

οὐδὲ τὸν ὀρθοδαῖ  
τῶν φθιμένων ἀνάγειν

*Choeph.* 380-1,

τοῦτο διαμπερές οὖς  
ἴκεθ' ἅπερ τι βέλος,

---

p. 37. For Greek literature we have Bergk's *Poetae Lyrici Graeci*<sup>4</sup>, to which should be added the later *Editio Minor* by Crusius, Leipzig, 1897, and Preger's *Inscriptiones Graecae Metricae ex Scriptoribus praeter Anthologiam collectae*, Leipzig, 1891. Müller's *De Re Metrica* contains a tolerably complete survey of Latin literature from this point of view. In addition I have made a rapid examination, on the one side, to Gregory Nazianzen, on the other, to Boethius, inclusive, of those authors in whom such forms were at all likely to occur. My collection cannot claim to be exhaustive. It seems sufficient, however, for the purpose of this investigation.

= 394-5,

καὶ πότε' ἂν ἀμφιθαλῆς  
Ζεὺς ἐπὶ χεῖρα βάλοι;

*Eumenid.* 962-3,

ματροκασιγνήται,  
δαίμονες ὀρθονόμοι,

= 982-3,

ἀντιφόνους ἄτας  
ἀρπαλίσαι πόλεως

*Euripides, I. T.* 1235-6,

ὃν ποτε Δηλιάσιν  
καρποφόροις γνάλοις

= 1260-1,

παῖδ' ἀπενάσαστο Λα-  
τφος ἀπὸ ζαθέων<sup>1</sup>

*Rhesos*, 245-6,

λήματος· ἧ σπανία  
τῶν ἀγαθῶν ὅταν ᾶ'

= 256-7,

μῖμον ἔχων ἐπὶ γᾶν  
θηρός; ἔλοι Μενέλαν

*Troades*, 822-3,

Λαομεδόντιε παῖ,  
Ζανὸς ἔχεις κυλίκων

= 842-3,

οὐρανίδαισι μέλων·  
ὥς τότε μὲν μεγάλως

*Kyklops*, 74,

ὦ φίλος, ὦ φίλε Βακχεῖε, ποῖ οἰοπολεῖς;

*Orestes*, 1436,

φάρεα πορφύρεα, δῶρα Κλυταιμνήστρα

*Helena*, 1479-80 (quoted by Christ, l. c.),

γενοίμεθα Λίβνες (corrupt)  
οἰωνοὶ στολάδες

= 1496-7,

δι' αἰθέρος ἰέμενοι  
παῖδες Τυνδαρίδαι<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> But see Bruhn's critical note on these lines.

<sup>2</sup> I have omitted Eurip. *Suppl.* 280, quoted by Christ, l. c. The text is very troublesome. See Wecklein's critical note and appendix.

Aristoph., *Nubes*, 1158,

οἶος ἐμοὶ τρέφεται  
τοῖσδ' ἐνὶ δώμασι παῖς

It will be observed that in eight of these nineteen cases strophe corresponds to antistrophe in the usual way, hence, we really have but eleven to consider.

A comparison of these "dramatic pentameters" with the average elegiac pentameter reveals differences that, it seems to me, are sufficiently marked to render a change in terminology desirable. For example:

In the first hemistich of the elegiac pentameter the general rule is that either or both of the dactyls may be replaced by spondees. It may be added, however, that, in a large majority of cases, one of the dactyls *is* replaced by a spondee. This is especially true of the Roman poets, as might be expected, but, with varying strictness, the rule applies to the distich throughout its entire history. Of course, the reason for it is plain enough. In this connection I examined the Greek distich previous to and contemporary with the drama, obviously the only period of its history to be considered, and found that only about twenty per cent. of the pentameters—one case in five—had two pure dactyls in the first hemistich.

If now we turn to our dramatic examples we find that no less than ten of the eleven cases keep two dactyls in the first hemistich. Now, of course, the question of monotony does not have to be taken into consideration here. These 'dramatic pentameters' always occur alone and are very rare, whereas the regular elegiac pentameter recurs every second verse as long as the poem goes on. But after all possible allowances are made this explanation still seems insufficient to account for a difference so marked.

And this is not all. Turning to Euripides, *Orestes*, 1436 and *Helena*, 1479 = 1496 (quoted by Christ) we find that the rigid and universal rule of pure dactyls in the second hemistich is not observed.

Thirdly, we may consider the quantity of the last syllable in the first hemistich. We have already seen<sup>1</sup> that under the Empire it was held by some metricians that this syllable might be either long or short. But previous to that time, indeed, by the best authors, as a rule, of that period, this syllable is kept

<sup>1</sup> See p. 166, note 1,

long. This rule of the elegiac pentameter is very rarely broken. Christ, p. 207, notes Theognis 2, 440, 478, 1066 and 1232. These are all in one author, and I observed no other cases in the pre-dramatic distich (about 1200 pentameters). But no less than two of our nineteen<sup>1</sup> 'dramatic pentameters,' Aisch., *Suppl.* 550, and Eurip., *Orestes* 1436, exhibit the exceptional short syllable at the close of the first hemistich. Helena 1479, as noted above, is corrupt.

Finally, if we follow Christ and include among our examples *Helena* 1479-80 = 1496-7, the result is not only two pentameters which, as we have said above, have a spondee in the second hemistich, but, if the text of the antistrophe is correct, both pentameters must have been read with anacrusis. I confess that, except for Christ, I should not have thought of these lines as pentameters. The antistrophe begins:

μόλοιτέ ποθ' ἱππιον οἶμα  
δι' αἰθέρος ἰέμενοι  
παῖδες Τυνδαρίδαι

I scanned these as two prosodiaci followed by one dactylic tripod catalectic as a clausula, which is its most common use.<sup>2</sup>

But at all events, even if we drop out this example, and also Eurip. *I. T.* 1235-6 = 1260-1 which, as shown by Bruhn's critical note, is more than doubtful for purposes of metre, it still seems clear to me that the peculiarities we have noted point, one and all, to the conclusion that these "dramatic pentameters," which even in the time of Euripides have the air of being old-fashioned, are not pentameters at all and were never intended to be, but rather pairs of dactylic tripodies catalectic. When compared with the regular elegiac pentameter both their freedoms and their restrictions suggest it. The elegiac pentameter, though originally a compound verse, is very distinctly an unity. The difference between this verse and a pair of verses, especially in this discussion, is important. If we consider these examples as pairs of verses all the peculiarities observed are amply explained and justified.

<sup>1</sup> I say nineteen instead of eleven because strophe does not match antistrophe in a peculiarity of this sort, and hence the pair should not be counted as one.

<sup>2</sup> See 693, 1499, 1508 of the same play, *Hippol.* 59, etc., and Christ, p. 151. For this use of prosodiaci in pairs, which is not unusual, comp. Aisch. *S. T.* 751-2 = 759-60, Soph. *Antig.* 353-4 = 365-6, and Christ, p. 214.



Taken as pairs of dactylic tripodies catalectic the occurrence of spondees would be exceptional anyhow, but not more so in one line than in the other. Conversely, pure dactyls are just as desirable in one as in the other.

So, too, whether the dactylic tripody catalectic is used singly, or as a clausula, which is its most common application, or in pairs, as in the examples before us, or in a series, as Eurip. *Troad.* 1094, f., the final syllable of it is long. Exceptions though rare are not more so in one than in another verse of a given series. In our dramatic examples, as it happens, all the exceptions were found in the first verse, which reverses the occasional license discovered in the elegiac pentameter of a short syllable at the end, not of the first, but of the second hemistich. In other words, in a pair of dactylic tripodies catalectic the two verses practically stand on the same footing.

Finally, we saw that at *Kyklops* 74 and, if we accept the text, *I. T.* 1260-1, Euripides divided a proper noun, which was not a compound, between two tripodies. If these lines are really pentameters the author has given us the only two genuine exceptions to the rule of diaeresis that I find quoted.<sup>1</sup> If, however, as seems clear, they are not pentameters, but pairs of dactylic tripodies catalectic, Euripides was quite within his rights in availing himself of a license for which there are parallels on almost any page of Greek lyric poetry.

If I am right in believing that these dramatic verses are really pairs of tripodies, the pentameter with verses other than the hexameter, so far as I have observed, is confined to a single case. This is an epitaph of four lines from Ithaka and belonging to the Macedonian period.<sup>2</sup> The pentameter takes the place of the usual iambic trimeter catalectic to form a distich with the Fourth Archilochian. The regular combination is best known from Horace, *Odes*, I 4, 1, f., 'Solvitur acris hiems grata,' etc.

The form of this epitaph was evidently *ad hoc*. The poet really desired to write elegiac distichs but, like some other tombstone bards, found himself confronted not by a theory but by a condition. This was the corpse's name,<sup>3</sup> *Εὐθύδαμος*, which will

<sup>1</sup> It has already been seen that the compound name in the example quoted by Hephaestion stands on a different footing.

<sup>2</sup> Kaibel, 187 = CIG, 1925: Allen, 'Greek Versification in Inscriptions,' Papers of the Am. School at Athens, vol. IV, p. 44.

<sup>3</sup> For similar difficulties compare Kaibel, 211 (hex. + iamb. trim. + two distichs), and 117 (same + three distichs).

not submit to the distich because it contains a cretic. The nearest approach to the hexameter was the Archilochian, while for the second line the poet returned to the pentameter because, from their character and associations, iambic verses are repugnant to the solemnity of the epitaph.

B. Use of the pentameter as a monostich.

Here the material collected is considerable and yields interesting results.

The two<sup>1</sup> oldest and most famous are the composition of Hipparchos and, therefore, may be dated in the sixth century before Christ. They are quoted by Plato, *Hipparch.* 228, D f. He says that Hipparchos set up Hermae along the roads, etc., and after selecting the wisest sayings he could discover or devise, 'ταῦτα αὐτὸς ἐντείνας εἰς ἐλεγείον,' had them inscribed on these Hermae for the instruction of the travelling public. There are two of these inscriptions, says Plato. On the left of each Hermes he is made to say, ὅτι ἐν μέσῳ τοῦ ἄστεος καὶ τοῦ δήμου ἔστηκεν<sup>2</sup>; on the right, he is made to say, Μνήμα τόδ' Ἰππάρχου· στείχε δίκαια φρονῶν.

As one of the 'many fine poems' of Hipparchos on other Hermae, Plato also quotes:

Μνήμα τόδ' Ἰππάρχου· μὴ φίλον ἐξαπάτα.

Preger writes these two pentameters in such a way as to show that, in his opinion, they really form a distich with the hexameter which Plato is supposed to be quoting indirectly. Of course, this is not impossible, but I should prefer to follow Bergk and (probably) Crusius; first, because this use of the pentameter is well attested by other undoubted examples throughout antiquity; second, because not only were the supposed hexameter and the pentameter inscribed in different places but, also, because I fail to discover any connection in thought between them.<sup>3</sup> It should also be observed that Plato's word ἐλεγείον is not infrequently applied to the pentameter alone.<sup>4</sup>

The sphere, content and purpose of these two verses are distinctly such as we might expect of a monostich. They actually

<sup>1</sup> Bergk, PLG<sup>4</sup>, II, p. 237; Crus., p. 123, and *adnot.* p. xxxv; Preger, p. 157; Wachsmuth, *Stadt Athen*, I, p. 498, II, p. 391; Bergk, *Gr. Lit.* II, p. 175.

<sup>2</sup> For the various more or less futile attempts to restore these words to a hexameter, see the authorities quoted in note 16, with references.

<sup>3</sup> Comp. for example, the 'restorations' mentioned in Wachsmuth, l. c.

<sup>4</sup> So Plutarch, 1141 A; Schol. Arist. *Pax*, 1199.

were inscriptions. Moreover, we are safe in assuming that, although only these two examples happen to have survived, such single pentameters were an ordinary thing, especially in this very period when, as Bergk, *GL*. II 175, has observed, the tendency to versify popular wisdom was so marked. Plato himself speaks of the 'many other beautiful poems' of Hipparchos and expressly states that they were meant to offset, if not replace, rival wisdom at Delphi, *γνώθι σαυτόν, μηδὲν ἄγαν*, and the like. In that case the political object and significance of *μνήμα τόδ' Ἰππάρχου* is clear enough. Why the most natural and most common form of the monostich, the hexameter, was not used is a question to which I shall return later.

Other cases which I noted in Greek literature were, for the most part, more doubtful. Though a given pentameter may have been quoted singly, and also contain an independent gnome, we cannot be certain that it was written as a monostich unless so stated by the author who quotes it. Cases of this sort are:

Solon, 6, Cr.; 7, B.,

*ἐργασιν ἐν μεγάλοις πᾶσιν ἀδεῖν χαλεπόν*

Kritias, 4, Cr.; 6, B.,

*ἐκ μελέτης πλείους ἢ φύσεως ἀγαθοί*

Frag. Eleg. Adesp., 12 Cr.

*τὸν φρουρὸν φρουρεῖν χρεή, τὸν ἐρῶντα δ' ἐρᾶν.*

Simonid., 70, Cr.; 87, B.,

*Ζεὺς πάντων αὐτὸς φάρμακα μῦθος ἔχει.*

In all such cases as these the difficulty of reaching a definite conclusion is still further increased by the fact that in the distich the gnome, if there is one, is always found, naturally and historically, in the pentameter.

A better case is a line of Evenos, quoted by Plutarch, 497, A (Comp. Cr. 6, B. II 271, Preger, 50):

*ὥστε ἐπαινέσθαι καὶ μνημονεύεσθαι τοῦ Εὐήνου τοῦτο μόνον ὡς ἐπέγραψεν  
ἡ δέος ἢ λύπη παῖς πατρὶ πάντα χρόνον.*

Doehner, says Bergk, emended to *τοῦτο τὸ μονόστιχον ἐπίγραμμα*, after Hecker, who thought the verse sepulchral. According to this Plutarch expressly stated that the pentameter of Evenos was a monostich. But the emendation is not called for. We must, therefore, leave the question unanswered—which seems safer than to assume with Preger that the verse was *not* a monostich.

A still better example occurs in the life of Aischylos found in some MSS.<sup>1</sup> Here the author says, in conclusion :

ἐπιγέγραπται τῷ τάφῳ αὐτοῦ  
αἰετοῦ ἐξ ὀνύχων βρέγμα τυπείς ἔθανον,

referring, of course, to the famous story of the death of Aischylos.<sup>2</sup>

This,<sup>3</sup> and the fragment of Evenos quoted by Plutarch, *Mor.* 497, A, seem to me tolerably clear cases of the pentameter used as a monostich. Moreover, though the other four are by no means attested, they are quite possible.

Turning now to Greek inscriptions I find that, although in many cases their dates can not be fixed, single pentameters are found all the way from the fifth century before Christ.

Pausan., 5, 27, 2; Preger, 55:

Φόρμις ἀνέθηκεν  
Ἀρκὰς Μαινάλιος, νῦν δὲ Συνακόσιος.

This was the inscription on the bronze horses dedicated at Olympia by Phormis, the general of Hiero and Gelo.<sup>4</sup>

Exactly parallel is one set up by Herodes Atticus some centuries later. Comp. Kaibel, 1090; Philostratos, II, p. 66 (K): CIG, I, 989:

Ἡρώς Πολυδευκίων,  
ταῖσδ' ἐποτ' ἐν τριόδοις σὺν σοὶ ἐπεστρεφόμην.

A third is found on a lamp in the British Museum :<sup>5</sup>

εἰμὶ δὲ Πανσανίου τοῦ καταπυγοτάτου,

where, although I find only the single line quoted in Kaibel, and the Arch. Zeit. for 1873 is not available to me, the δέ evidently implies some preceding statement regarding the maker.<sup>6</sup>

<sup>1</sup> For the text of this life, see Weil, *Aeschylus*, Teubner, 1891, p. 312; Sedgwick, *Aeschylus*, Oxford, s. d. end; Preger, p. 205; Westermann's *Biographi Graeci*, Brunswick, 1845, p. 122.

<sup>2</sup> Discussed by E. Rohde, *JJ*, 121, p. 22, f.

<sup>3</sup> "Apparently a fragment of some late epigram on the poet, though I grant that some one may have composed this single pentameter." Preger, p. 205. Comp. Preger, No. 39, and Westermann, *Biographi Graeci*, Brunswick, 1845, p. 120.

<sup>4</sup> Comp. Gurlitt on *Pausan.* 5, 27, 2. Bergk, *Opusc.* II, p. 400, attempted to write as three verses. But comp. Preger, p. 45.

<sup>5</sup> Kaibel, 1131; Allen, p. 43; Hirschfeld, *Arch. Zeit.*, 1873, p. 109.

<sup>6</sup> *καταπυγοτάτου* is a pleasantry which was to be expected of any antique lamp as the confidant of the small hours. Comp. Arist. *Eccles.* 1, f.; Anth. Gr. V. 3, 4, 6, 7, etc.

A different type is represented by Kaibel, 759; Hirschfeld, Arch. Zeit., 1873, p. 108:

Πύθων Ἑρμῇ ἀγαλμα Ἑρμοστράτου Ἀβδηρίτης  
ἐστησε πολλὰς θησάμενος πόλῃας.  
Ἐύφρων ἐξεποίησ' οὐκ ἄδαῖς Πάριος.

Here the distich is the real inscription. The following pentameter is independent, since it is the artist's signature. To the same category belongs Allen, LXXXII; Löwy, 88; CIG, 2984. In Kaibel, 806, the pentameter really forms an independent inscription.

Lastly, the two following *dedicationes* consist each of merely a single pentameter and, with requisite changes, were, doubtless, often repeated:

CIA, IV, 2, p. 262 (1558, L),

Πειθοῖ Καλλιμα[χος] τήνδ' ἀνέθηκε Σολεύς.

This was found on the Eleusinian way and one hemistich is written above the other.

The second is from Posidonia and written to the left (Allen, p. 200; IGA. 542; Curtius, Arch. Zeit. 38, p. 27):

Τάθάναι Φιλλῶ Χαρμυλίδα δεκάτα[ν].

A survey of poetical inscriptions on the Roman side reveals a considerable number of single pentameters.<sup>1</sup> I may quote:

Buech., 886; CIL, XIV, 2773 (comp. Kaib. 829):

Hortulus hic Vari est opus Alcinoui.

On a Hermes. The hemistichs are separated.

Buech., 921:

Crux est vita mihi, mors, inimice, tibi.

On a golden cross in the grave of a Christian buried in the Basilica di San Lorenzo.

Buech., 933; CIL, IV, 1880:

At quem non ceno, barbarus ille mihi est.

Preceded by *L. Istacidi* (vocative). A Pompeian *graffito* in which *at quem* belongs to the same sphere of Latinity as the *foras cenat* of Petron. 30.

<sup>1</sup>Buecheler, Carm. Epig. Nos. 886; 921; 933; 952; 962(?); 1451 f.; 1491; 1492 (a quotation from *Mart.* 2, 59, 4); 1493; 1501 f.; 1124 (probably belongs to a longer epitaph); 1291.

Buech., 952; CIL, IV, 1118, *add.* p. 203. Another Pompeian *graffito* founded on Propertius, 3 (4), 23, 6:

Iam docui silices verba [benigna] loqui.

Buech., 962; CIL, X, 1284. At Nola:

Nardu poeta pudens hoc tegitur tumulo.

Buech., 1452; CIL, II, *suppl.* 5241, Hübner:

Dic rogo qui transis sit tibi terra levis.

The important part of this pentameter, 'sit tibi terra levis,' is, deservedly, a great favorite with the epitaphs. In the form 'dic rogo praeteriens sit tibi,' etc. (B. 1453), and 'praeteriens dicas sit tibi,' etc. (B. 1454), it is so common as to be abbreviated to *s t t l*. Sometimes (1452-5) a pentameter containing these words is added, as a clausula, to prose. Again (1456-7) it is added to a hexameter and we have a sort of distich by aggregation. So, too, such an irregular combination as Buech. 1451; CIL, II 558:

Tu qui carpis iter gressu properante viator

Siste gradum quaeso, quod peto parva mora est,

Oro ut praeteriens dicas: s. t. t. l.

is merely due to the aggregation of a distich with the favorite line of the bereaved. A large majority of irregularities in the epitaphs and other inscriptions are clearly due to similar processes of construction and, of course, call for no discussion here. Again the *s t t l* is preceded by *optamus cuncti* (1460), *omnis optamus* (1461), *et tu qui dederis* (1462).

Other, probably conventional, pentameters are Buech. 1464-5, 1491 and 1493. Buech. 1492; Hübner, *Insc. Brit. Christ.* 134, is a quotation of Martial, II 59, 4. Buech. 1503 may also be mentioned. But 1124 probably belongs to a longer epitaph. Finally some others might be added which, at first sight, would appear to belong in other categories.

A survey of these examples collected from both Latin and Greek is attended, it seems to me, with some interesting results. Omitting those which perhaps may be considered as favorite quotations from a pattern distich and, at times, still found in a distich, we still have about a score of pentameters which can hardly be termed anything but monostichs. It is true that this seems a small number to glean from so long a period of poetical activity. But the tradition of them is unbroken and their nature and use imply the existence in antiquity of many others like them.

The usual verse to be employed as a monostich is the hexameter. Why use the pentameter, which from a very early period and, one might say, more than any other verse in all antiquity, was identified with one form and one only?

Adopting the generally accepted theory of origin for both hexameter and pentameter, with which I see no reason for disagreeing, it seems not unreasonable to look for an answer in the consideration of the shorter dactylic verses which are older than either of them. The dactylic tripod catalectic, for example, is certainly one of the oldest of all Greek verses.<sup>1</sup> Proverbs, sayings, brief votive inscriptions and the like primitive types of formal composition ought to be among the first to appear in metre and, as a matter of fact, whatever its origin and other uses, the tripod, in its employment as a single verse, lies, to a marked degree, within this sphere. That it was frequently and naturally used in pairs at a very early period is suggested, for example, by the fact that the regular pentameter itself was afterwards derived from that combination.

Now, when we observe that the regular elegiac pentameter, until, as in the dramatic examples, we pause to examine details, bears so close a resemblance to the double tripodies from which it developed; also, that, in this use as a monostich, the pentameter is so distinctly confined to proverbs and old said sooth, *ex-votis* and similar primitive themes of composition; may we not believe that after it rose and developed in connection with the hexameter, the pentameter, as an inevitable result of its wider fame as well as its close resemblance, finally absorbed the somewhat humble and contracted sphere in which the use of a pair of tripodies had survived from a remote antiquity? In the earliest times the real distinction, in form and sphere, between these single pairs of tripodies and the regular elegiac pentameter would, naturally, be recognized. Indeed, all the way down, it was never altogether forgotten. Compare, for instance, the notably strong pause between hemistichs as well as their independence in such ancient examples as the lines of Hipparchos.<sup>2</sup> Centuries later, the strong hiatus in such a case as,

Hortulus hic Vari est opus Alcinoi,

leads to the same conclusion. Even the conservatism, observed

<sup>1</sup> See Christ, par. 190.

<sup>2</sup> Bergk, *Opusc.* II 400, does write as three verses the Phormis inscription (*Paus.* 5, 27, 2) which belongs to the fifth century B. C.

in some of these inscriptions, of writing one tripod above the other—although not always demanded by the shape of the object—is not without some weight in the same connection. On the other hand, the fact that Plato calls the verse of Hipparchos an *ἐλεγείον* needs mean no more than that, in this particular sphere, the confusion of tripodies and pentameter was already accomplished. But although the original form may have become completely identified with that found in the better known distich, yet the process lingered in the persistent tradition that in some way or other it was entirely proper to use the elegiac pentameter as a monostich within the limits of the sphere originally occupied by the double tripod.

When, therefore, in the fourth century after Christ we find Professor Ausonius choosing to put seven saws of Anacharsis<sup>1</sup> into as many pentameters, we may assert that he is following a well established tradition which, in examples still surviving, can be traced back to an exactly parallel use of Hipparchos, nearly a thousand years before. In all that period the sphere of the pentameter as a monostich coincides exactly with that of the form which it absorbed. I know of no surviving example which transgresses the rule.

C. The pentameter *κατὰ στίχον* is very rarely used. The earliest is an old votive inscription quoted by Aristotle, *Ἀθην. Πολ.*, 7, 4 :

Διφίλου Ἀνθεμίῳ τήνδ' ἀνέθηκε θεοῖς,  
θητικοῦ ἀντὶ τέλους ἱππάδ' ἀμειψάμενος.<sup>2</sup>

Three more cases are found in Kaibel (326, 510 and 605). The first is an epitaph of the third or fourth century A. D. found in Thasos. The writer is one Aurelius Philippos of Abdera. His style betrays several marked Latinisms, and the two pentameters standing in the midst of his prose are unusually bad. The second is also late and not much better. 605 (CIG, 6209) is the best. It is the epitaph of a comic actor buried at Messina :

Παφιανὸς Πάφιος τῆδ' ἐπὶ γῇ λέλυμε,  
κωμωδὸς λιθθεὶς τὸν βίοντος στέφανον.

Neither this nor the ancient verses quoted by Aristotle belong to the stage of culture represented by Aurelius and the "two worthy heroes" of Kaibel, 510.

<sup>1</sup> Auson., p. 249, Schenkl. This form should not be cited as a case of the pentameter *κατὰ στίχον*. It is a mere bundle of monostichs.

<sup>2</sup> See Herwerden and Kenyon here. Also quoted by Pollux, VIII 131.



On the literary side the most interesting example is the *Anthologia Graeca*, XIII 1, an epigram, and apparently the introductory epigram, of Philippos who lived near the time of Tiberius and was the compiler of the second anthology.<sup>1</sup> The poem consists of five pentameters. The first is pure, the second has a spondee in the first place, the third, a spondee in the first two places, and so on in regular succession until the last line which has nothing but spondees, as the first had nothing but dactyls. The period was one in which, as we learn from several sources,<sup>2</sup> all sorts of experiments in metre were being tried, but whether this form was a special creation of Philippos I cannot say. At any rate the observed use of the pentameter, or what was taken for the pentameter, *κατὰ στίχον* was probably the suggestion of it, and the appearance of it in literature tends to show that it was more common than the scanty remains might, otherwise, have led one to suppose.<sup>3</sup>

The Latin inscriptions yield no examples of the pentameter *κατὰ στίχον*. But from the literature three cases are cited by Müller, *de Re Met.*, p. 103:

Lampridius, *vita Diadum. Hist. Aug. XVI 7, 3*:

“ ‘Commodus Herculeum nomen habere cupit,  
Antoninorum non putat esse bonum,  
Expers humani iuris et imperii,  
Sperans quin etiam clarius esse deum,  
Quam si sit princeps nominis egregii.  
Non erit iste deus nec tamen ullus homo,’

Hi versus a Graeco nescio quo compositi a malo poeta in Latinum translati sunt, etc.”

It would appear to be the form of these verses which prompted the criticism of Lampridius. If so, the opinion of it, even as late as the third century and from a man no better educated than Lampridius, is of interest. Doubtless the tendency, now and then, to write just such verses as these is what called forth the statement of Atilius Fortunatianus, VI 291, 18, K, that the pentameter ‘seorsum ac solitarium carmen facere non potest.’<sup>4</sup>

The second case belongs to the time of Honorius and is the

<sup>1</sup> See Christ, *GL*. p. 620 (Müller's Handb. vol. VII).

<sup>2</sup> See, for example, Teuffel-Schwabe, *Röm. Lit.* 282, 3 (Remmius Palaemon).

<sup>3</sup> Compare Buecheler, *Rhein. Mus.* 38, III and the *πεντάμετρον ἐπικόν* (pure spondees) of Helios, *Stud.*, p. 145, and *Tract. Harl. Stud.*, p. 17, 24.

<sup>4</sup> Hephaist., p. 52, W.; Schol., p. 171 f.; Aristid., p. 52; Terent. Maur. 1721 f.

composition of Martianus Capella (907, p. 339, Eyss.). It consists of 27 pentameters. The technique, on the whole, is correct enough, although the worthy African evidently found nothing to displease him in a succession of three verses like these,

Quo fertur rabidas perdomuisse feras,  
Quo vidit rigidas glandibus ire comas  
Ismaros et silvas currere monte suas.

From the same period and the same part of the world comes a Greek *φδῆ* composed by Heliodoros (Aethiopica, 3, 2, p. 79, Bekk.) and supposed to be sung in honor of Peleus and Thetis at a Thessalian festival and sacrifice :

*Tân Θέτιν αἰίδω, χρυσόθεϊρα Θέτιν,  
Nḡρός ἀθανάταν εἰναλίοιο κόραν  
Tân Διὸς ἐννεσίῃ Πηλεί γημαμέναν,  
Tân ἀλὸς ἀγλαίαν, ἀμετέραν Παφίην*

and so on for thirteen lines with a goodly sprinkling of Doric and ending with a repetition of the first line.

The third case<sup>1</sup> quoted by Müller is Ausonius, 11 (Sch. p. 63), a laudatory poem addressed to his colleagues in the University of Bordeaux. But, although the text tradition is very unsatisfactory, a moment's examination of these lines will show that they were never intended for anything but dactylic tripodies catalectic, and so, in fact, Schenkl arranges them. If we arrange as pentameters the first hemistich contains pure dactyls in every case but three. There are, also, two cases of hiatus after the final syllable of the first hemistich. These facts are the more significant because Ausonius makes a large use of the distich elsewhere and writes it well. The poem does not belong to the same type as those quoted from Capella and Heliodoros.

The well known verses of the Vergilian tradition, 'Sic vos non vobis,' etc. (Vita Verg. 69-70, Heyne-Wag, p. xcix, etc.) are not to be included here since, as Müller, l. c. observes (comp. Hermann, *El. d. met.*, p. 360), the hexameter

*Hos ego versiculos feci; tulit alter honores;*

was to be supplied with each one of the four 'sic vos non vobis'

<sup>1</sup> Müller does not give the reference, but he can hardly refer to the monostichs of Anacharsis, and 11 is the only other piece that could have been meant.

after they had been filled out by the missing words, thus making four complete distichs.<sup>1</sup>

These are all the cases of the pentameter *κατὰ στίχον* in Greek and Latin which I have happened to discover. Examples are much more rare than those of the pentameter as a monostich and the usage never rose to the same plane of culture. Nevertheless, it also began in the early period, continued to occur with considerable frequency, was even developed for literary purposes and, as we have seen, finally ran out in the theory of an epic form consisting entirely of spondees. This ought to imply many more examples than we now possess. Especially interesting is the type given by Heliodoros.

Such an enormous prolongation of life for this weakly changeling seems, in itself, to betray the tonic effects of some sort of secondary theorizing. The pentameter as a monostich may have been the analogy in part, but I am inclined to think that the persistency of the pentameter *κατὰ στίχον* was, also, partly due to a confusion of it with the tripod used in multiples of two. It is quite true that, as far as extant literature is concerned, the use of the dactylic tripod catalectic more than twice in succession is extremely rare. Still, no less a poet than Euripides (*Troad.* 1094) used it so once, nor is the testimony of Ausonius, eight centuries later, to be despised, since it doubtless rests on ancient tradition now lost to us.

The hymn of Heliodoros to Peleus and Thetis, one of the latest manifestations of this subject so long popular,<sup>2</sup> was undoubtedly intended for pentameters. Like the verses of Capella it seems to belong to the period of late African culture. I cannot discover that it has any roots, so far as form is concerned, in an earlier choral literature, Greek or Latin.

<sup>1</sup>Quamobrem [Bathyllus] donatus honoratusque a Caesare fuit, quod aequo animo non ferens Vergilius, iisdem valvis affixit quater hoc principium: *sic vos non vobis*; postulabat Augustus ut hi versus complerentur; quod cum frustra aliqui conati essent, Vergilius praeposito disticho sic subiunxit:

Hos ego versiculos feci; tulit alter honores:  
Sic vos non vobis nidificatis aves.  
Sic vos non vobis vellera fertis oves.  
Sic vos non vobis mellificatis apes.  
Sic vos non vobis fertis aratra boves.

<sup>2</sup>See Ellis, *Introd.* to Catullus LXIV, p. 278: Reitzenstein, *Die Hochzeit des Peleus und der Thetis*, Hermes, XXXV, 73 f.

## II.

Cases in which the pentameter occurs with the hexameter, but irregularly. The most notable of these is the one in which we find:

A. The usual position of hexameter and pentameter reversed.

Our information regarding this form and, to a large extent, our best examples of it are due to Athenaios. In connection with a story which smacks strongly of later times Athenaios, 602, C, tells us that some persons who proposed to make away with Phalaris, the famous tyrant of Agrigentum, 570-550, B. C., consulted the oracle on the subject and received the following reply:

Εὐδαίμων Χαρίτων καὶ Μελάνιππος ἔφν,  
θείας ἀγητῆρες ἐφαμερίους φιλότατος.<sup>1</sup>

"In later times," adds Athenaios, "this form was used by Dionysios Chalkus, the Athenian,<sup>2</sup> in his elegies." Dionysios belonged to the fifth century B. C. and led a colony to Thurii (Plut. Nik. 6). The rest of his history, so far as we know it, is largely preserved in his nickname of ὁ Χαλκοῦς, the "Copperite," derived, as Athenaios (669, D) also tells us, from his advocacy of a financial system based on the same principles as that advocated by the Honorable William Jennings Bryan. His poetry seems to have been about as much below par as the coin which his policy contemplated. Owing to accident of quotation, only the first two fragments happen to begin with pentameters. An examination of these, especially the first, which apparently formed a portion of his dedication, tends to show that Dennis Cheap-money did not alter the usual pauses and sentence construction of the regular distich to fit his new scheme. For example, a majority of his pentameters coincide, at the close, with a distinct pause in sense. If these peculiarities were carried through his work the result would be that little else but the first and last line of an elegy could remind us that the form was abnormal, and we should fail to get the effect—inartistic but curious—which, otherwise, might have been produced. It would be interesting to know whether the mental attitude which prompted the deliberate choice of such a form was reflected in oddities of literary style,

<sup>1</sup> Also quoted by Eusebios, Praep. Evang. V 35, 2.

<sup>2</sup> Osann, Beiträge, etc., 1835, I, pp. 79-140; Christ, *GL.*, p. 133; Bergk, *GL.* II 511; Welcker, *Kl. Schr.* II, p. 220. Fragments in Crusius, p. 129; Bergk, *PLG.* II, p. 262.

but the fragments are too scanty to judge. There is nothing to show that either in Greek or Latin literature this form was ever attempted again. Moreover, it is worth noting that Dionysios' experiment belongs in the period after the art of the old Ionian masters had, to a certain extent, been lost and before its attempted recovery by the Alexandrian poets. Whether he found his suggestion in forms like the oracle quoted by Athenaios or was simply moved to turn the distich bottom side up as an experiment it is impossible to say. But primitive forms like the oracle are probably due to accident and to be considered ancient folk variations of the hexameter rather than of the distich.<sup>1</sup> Kaibel's collection yields no further examples of this form, and Buech. 1202 and 1308, the two cases found among Latin inscriptions, are too irregular and corrupt to be of any importance.

B. Among the cases in which one or more regular distichs are followed by some irregularity at the end of the piece may be mentioned: One distich followed by one pentameter.

Kaibel, 589, 759 and 806. The irregularity of 759 and 806 is more apparent than real. The third line is the artist's inscription and, therefore, to be counted as a single pentameter. 589 is the result of collocation, that is, the third line appears to be a favorite sentiment from another source tacked on at the end.

In the same manner Buech. 1020, 1039, 1082, 1193, 1220, 1326, 1482 are the result of collocation merely. Buech. 880, the one example remaining, was scratched on the Memnon Statue, May 21, 134 A. D.:

Horam cum primam cumque horam sole secundam  
proluta Oceano luminat alma dies,  
Vox audita mihi est ter bene Memnonia,

where the third line betrays the amateur. Underneath is written: "... epistr]ategus Thebaidos fecit cum audit Memnonem XI Kal. Iun. Serviano III cos. cum Asidonia Galla uxore." This type is not found in literature.

Cases of two or more distichs followed by a pentameter are found only in Latin inscriptions. These are Buech. 1085, 1121, 1123 and 1124, all bad, and all the result of collocation.

Of those cases in which one or more distichs are followed by one or more hexameters only one variety seems to deserve mention. This is: One distich followed by one hexameter, or one distich and a half.

<sup>1</sup> See Usener, *Altg. Versbau*, p. 99.

Kaibel, 34, 75, 140, 172 (mutilated), 273, 296, 468, 697a (indexed 597a, by mistake), 750 (frag.), 1007. The best are Kaibel, 75, CIG, 749:

Πολλὰ μεθ' ἡλικίας ὁμοήλικος ἡδέα παῖσας  
ἐκ γαίης βλαστῶν γαῖα πάλιν γέγονα·  
εἰμὶ δὲ Ἀριστοκλῆς Πειραιεύς, παῖς δὲ Μένωνος.

Fourth or third century. For the second line K. quotes Theog. 878, Eurip. Frag. 757 (N). K. 35 and 273 belongs to the same type.

Kaibel, 1007, CIG, Add. III 4761 c. (on the Memnon Statue):

Εἰ καὶ λωβητῆρες ἐλνυμῆναντο δέμας σόν,  
ἀλλὰ σύ γ' αὐθήμες, ὥς κλύον αὐτὸς ἐγώ.  
Μέττιος, ὦ Μέμνον, Παίων τάδ' ἐγραψε Σιδήτης.

The cases found in the Latin inscriptions are Buecheler, 1010, 1089, 1090, 1092, 1146, 1267, 1489. The best is 1489; CIL. II 4426; AL. Burm. IV 14:

Aspice quam subito marcet quod floruit ante,  
aspice quam subito quod stetit ante cadit,  
nascentes morimur finisque ab origine pendet.

Here the third line is a quotation from Manilius IV 14.

No cases occur in Latin literature. But in Greek literature I found two interesting examples:

Krates<sup>1</sup> Παίγνια, Anth. Gr. X 104:

Χαῖρε, θεὰ δέσποινα, σοφῶν ἀνδρῶν ἀγάπημα,  
Εὐτελῆς, κλεινῆς ἐγγονε Σωφροσύνης·  
σὴν ἀρετὴν τιμῶσιν, ὅσοι τὰ δίκαι' ἀσκοῦσιν.

Ammonios,<sup>2</sup> Anthol. Pal. IX 827:

Εἰμὶ μὲν εὐκεράσιο φίλος θεράπων Διονύσου,  
λείβω δ' ἀργυρέων ὕδατα Ναιάδων,  
θέλγω δ' ἡρεμέοντα νέον περὶ κόματι παῖδα.

To a Satyr standing by a spring and watching a Cupid asleep.

Without doubt there were many more cases of this form which we no longer possess. Some are the result of mere collocation or inexperience, but others are complete and deliberate. The form rose to literature, but only in the inscriptional sphere, so far

<sup>1</sup> See Christ, *GL*, p. 133; Susemihl, vol. I, p. 29 f.

<sup>2</sup> Jacobs, Anth. XIII 841; Christ, *GL*, p. 784. But esp. Reitzenstein, Pauly-Wiss. I, p. 1862, no. 11.

as one may judge from the two surviving examples just quoted. The suitable length for inscriptions had something to do with the popularity of this pattern. But the principal cause of its frequency and rise to a higher plane of culture as well as of its longevity was its quasi balance and symmetry. From this point of view the form is rather to be considered a single stanza than a distich followed by a pentameter. Forms which are cognate but not symmetrical in the same way never rose and were never popular. Such are the cases of one distich followed by two hexameters (K. 90, 490, 522, 545a; Buech. 922, 947), or by three hexameters (K. 277, 291, 386, 452c), or two or more distichs followed by one hexameter (Buech. 949, 1012, 1107, 1302).

C. Finally, we may consider those cases in which a single pentameter has been used to conclude a series of two or more hexameters. On the whole, this forms one of the most interesting and important of the aberrant types considered. The principle of composition is clear and, as far as it goes, logical. Moreover, it is artistic enough to have a certain literary value. The most striking as well as the most frequent of these types and the one which first called my attention to the subject is:

Two hexameters followed by one pentameter. Nine examples are found in Latin inscriptions. These are Buecheler, 1105, 1179, 1260, 1292, 1324, 1328, [1158, 1173, 1190].

Buech. 1105, CIL, XIV 316:

Hic sum positus qui semper sine crimine vixi,  
Et quem mi dederat cursum Fortuna peregit,  
Cuius ossua et cineres hic lapis intus habet.

This epitaph doubtless occurred, with slight changes, scores of times on gravestones of the period, not only because the sentiment is often repeated elsewhere, but, also, because this particular stone, which comes from Ostia, was put up in honor of one Epaphroditus, a *Sevir Augustalis* and a *Quinquennialis*, by his quondam associates in those offices. These were men whose knowledge of literature and whose ideas of an appropriate epitaph would be about the same as those possessed by an average city council of to-day. No doubt, on that occasion, the committee resorted to a source not unlike that which supplies metrical consolation to the bereaved relatives of the obituary column maintained by the morning paper. Rearrangement to hic positus sum would make the first line metrical. The verse is conven-

tional for epitaphs. For the second line compare Vergil, *A.* IV 653 and Buech. l. c. 385 and 814. *Peregīt* for *peregi* is explained by *Fortūna* and is probably due to the stone-cutter.

Buecheler, 1179, CIL, 8553 is perhaps the result of collocation :

Hic iacet ille situs M[arcus] formonsior ullo.  
quod meruit vivus, moriens quot et ipse rogavit,  
Coniugi sue gratae praestitit ecce fides.

The first line is the usual 'hic iacet,' etc. plus a reminiscent cadence. The second and third lines, i. e. the distich, are the common property of epitaphs. Compare B 1180 and 1181, also the first line of 1182. These explain how the bereaved Ulpia Veneria came to compose the epitaph in its present form. She indicated the place of her husband's burial and told how handsome he was.<sup>1</sup> She then desired a sentiment and the choice was a distich which she had read on other gravestones and which had struck her fancy. It will be seen, therefore, that in this case the form was not intended, but due, simply, to the juxtaposition of favorite sentiments. Indeed a large proportion of the irregularities of the elegiac distich is due to this method of composition. *Hoc* for *sue* would have improved the pentameter, but the fact that she was *his* wife was more important to Ulpia Veneria than a mere detail of metre.

In the same way B. 1260 is the result of collocation. B. 1292 is conventional. B. 1324 and 1328 belong to a lower sphere. B. 1158, 1173 and 1190 are attached to other distichs and therefore should not be counted here.

So far the sphere and social position of this form are clearly indicated. Moreover, the character as well as the frequency of surviving examples suggest how abundant it must have been and therefore how familiar to every Roman in the days when the roads leading out of any Italian town were lined with tombs.

Two cases, only, occur in Latin literature, but they are the stock examples of aberrancy in the form of the elegiac distich. Both are the composition of Trimalchio, who, among his many accomplishments, derived great comfort from courting the muse (comp. 41).

<sup>1</sup> The reference to personal beauty in ancient epitaphs is frequent and eminently characteristic. Comp. the epitaph of Scipio, B. 7 (CIL, I, 30); B. 52, 75, 80, 98, 237, 454, 969, 989, 995, 1033, 1035, 1038, 1040, 1044, 1057, 1061, 1136, 1137, 1151, 1188, 1240, 1307, 1329. Kaibel, 132, 151, 152, 169, 174.



Petron. 35: "While we were drinking . . . a slave brought in a silver skeleton so constructed that the joints and vertebrae could be turned in every direction. After he had thrown it down on the table a few times and the mechanism had struck several different attitudes, Trimalchio added:

'eheu nos miseros, quam totus homuncio nil est.  
Sic erimus cuncti, postquam nos auferet Orcus.  
Ergo vivamus, dum licet esse bene.<sup>1</sup>'"

As one might say in doggerel not much worse:

'Poor wretches we—alack, the thought  
That man, weak man, all told, is naught!  
When Death has claw'd us with his clutch  
Most certain 'tis that even such  
As this is now we all shall be,  
So let us live as best we may  
Until that day!'

Of course, Burmann, Friedlaender and others are entirely correct in their observation that this form is characteristic of uneducated people and that in using it here Petronius meant to display Trimalchio's lack of training as compared with his pretensions in the polite accomplishment of turning a distich.

But this is not all. We have already seen that this form suggests the epitaph, the freedman's epitaph. We even have something very much like the favorite juxtaposition of sentiments. Here are three independent separable verses in a row. Nor is it alone in form that this 'poem' of Trimalchio suggests the epitaph. In its content also it is an epitaph pure and simple. Is it going too far to suggest that in actually making it an epitaph, in inserting the stock phrases and reflections so dear to the monumental songsters of Trimalchio's class, Petronius may have meant to imply that he was practically palming off a time-honored roadside friend as his own composition? As though some modern Trimalchio, under the same circumstances, should remark: "By the way, that reminds me of a little poem of my own:

'Stay traveller as you pass by,  
As you are now so once was I;  
As I am now so you must be,  
Prepare for death and follow me,'"

lines familiar to any one who has ever seen a country grave-yard.

<sup>1</sup> The attempts of the old commentators quoted in Burmann's note to emend these verses illustrate the value of epigraphical study.

At any rate, in using this form Petronius certainly had in mind just such *obiter dicta* as we have been considering and as were perfectly familiar to all his readers.

The second example (Petron. 55) which Trimalchio calls an *inscriptio* and Sam Weller would, no doubt, describe as "a verse," belongs in the same category :

"We applauded his course and . . . fell into a discussion, illustrated by various examples, on the sudden changes to which human affairs are subjected. 'Yes,' said Trimalchio, 'it wont do to let this chance go by without a verse on it.' So saying, he at once called for his tablets, and without any long thought read out these :

"Quod non expectes, ex transverso fit,  
et supra nos Fortuna negotio curat,  
quare da nobis vina Falerna, puer,

(You're certain to be crost  
When you least expect it most.  
Fortune rules the roast  
We find it to our cost,  
So come, boy, pass the wine  
I prefer Falernian)."

This composition which, in the line following, Petronius properly terms an *epigramma* is called by Trimalchio an *inscriptio*. The difference is worth noting and again suggests the monumental sphere and inspiration of Trimalchio's muse. Whether in poetry, in the rhetorical schools, in popular phrase, and above all, of course, in epitaphs, scarcely another theme in antiquity was so frequently taken up as the mutability of Fortune.<sup>1</sup> Trimalchio's ideas and expression regarding this subject are eminently those of the tombstone. As before, the lines are independent and separable. The imperfection of the first two lines is, without doubt, original and intentional. Moreover, the inexperience of the writer is clearly portrayed in the heavy spondees and neglect of 'conflict.'

These two examples from Petronius appear to be the only specimens of this form now surviving in Roman literature. They are interesting, too, because we indirectly get the point of view of an educated man on them. This form clearly suggested epitaphs to cultivated Romans of the first century, and the remains as far as discovered have given the same impression to us.

<sup>1</sup> Juvenal, Sat. X ; Iustinus, I 7, 14 ; Dio Chrys. *Orat.* LXIV, etc.

On the Greek side Kaibel's index notes ten cases,<sup>1</sup> beginning with 52, fourth century B. C., showing remains of the pre-Euclidean alphabet and apparently from a lower sphere of life. All but two are epitaphs and on a level with the Roman examples already quoted. K. 1008 is inscribed on the left thigh of the Memnon Statue, and the writer has copied his first verse badly from a neighboring inscription (K. 1007). K. 823, CI, 6012c is perhaps the most interesting. The inscription, which is before 370 A. D. is on an altar to Rhea raised by Crescens and Leontius and written as two stanzas.

But one of the most interesting cases is found in Appian, B. C. I 97, who tells us that Sulla, the dictator, in response to an oracle, sent as offerings to his patron deity Venus a crown of gold and a battle-axe accompanied by an inscription:

“ἐπεμψε δὲ καὶ στέφανον χρυσοῦν καὶ πέλεκυν, ἐπιγράψας τὰδε·

‘τόνδε σοι αὐτοκράτωρ Σύλλας ἀνέθηκε’, Ἀφροδίτη,  
ὥς εἶδον κατ’ ὄνειρον ἅν’ ἀ στρατιῇν διέπονσαν  
τεύχεσι τοῖς Ἀρεος μαρναμένην ἐνοπλον.’”

Zeiss in his translation of Appian, Leipzig, 1837, thought that a pentameter had fallen out, but, as we have already seen, this is worth no more than similar emendations of Trimalchio's verses. There is no sign here that the text is corrupt, and no reason for questioning Appian's statement that these verses were the composition of the great dictator and for the purpose described.

It is hardly necessary to say that L. Cornelius Sulla was the antipodes of a Trimalchio. He was a man of cultivated tastes and varied accomplishments. His knowledge of Greek was practical and extensive, and his love of literature was no less genuine and active than his love of wine and women. The Romans had known and used the elegiac distich for a century. It was particularly affected by the contemporary school of Catulus and Licinus, and the movement destined shortly to produce the first great epigrammatist of Rome was already well under way.

Not only then was the distich well understood in general, but Sulla was the man of all men to understand it. He did not write his inscription in this form because he knew no better, but because he had good reason to think it proper for an *ex-voto*. So far, then, as Greek is concerned we must believe that this form, even

<sup>1</sup> Nos. 52, 132, 171, 370, 400, 662, 666, 687, 1008, 823.

at a tolerably early period, had more nearly attained a genuine literary position than it ever did in Latin, and had therefore occurred with much greater frequency than the remains would have suggested.<sup>1</sup> Another of the same form and intended for the titulus of a statue is Anthol. Pal. XIII 16. The author is not known.

Of the form, three hexameters followed by one pentameter, two cases, both well written, are found in Latin inscriptions:

B. 914; CIL, V, p. 617. In the church of St. Thecla, Milan. Attila destroyed the old church in 452. These verses refer to its restoration by Eusebius, 452-460.

B. 1188; CIL, VIII *Suppl.* 13110. In a tomb at Carthage belonging to the Caesars (Hadrian, etc.).

The Greek inscriptions yield ten cases.<sup>2</sup> They range from the first century B. C., but afford nothing striking.

The epigram attributed to Sophokles by Athenaios, 604 F, is doubtful both in form and authorship. See Crus. Soph. [3], p. 125.

Plutarch, Aem. Paul. 15 is followed by a regular distich and therefore does not belong here.

The form, four hexameters followed by one pentameter, is represented by one case in Greek, K. 708, and one in Latin, B. 1329.

Five hexameters + one pentameter is found only in K. 614 (CIG. 6260), an excellent and characteristic epitaph from Rome belonging to the second century.

Six hexameters + one pentameter is found in B. 1088 (very bad), K. 610 and Gregory Naz. (epitaph), *Anth. Pal.* VIII 29 (Migne, Patr. Graeca, XXXVIII, p. 49, no. 70). K. 609 is the only case of seven hexameters + one pentameter.

Further combinations of hexameters and pentameters sufficiently regular to imply design are all late and from the Greek. Such are:

Two hex. + two pentam., K. 278. Three hex. + three pentam., K. 933 (240 A. D.).

The considerable number of irregular forms still remaining are

<sup>1</sup> On the famous epigram of the fifth century B. C. quoted by Plutarch, *Arist.* 19, as two hexameters and a pentameter, but in *Mor.* 873 B, and in other authors as two regular distichs, see Preger, p. 65; Crusius, Simonid. [126], p. 259.

<sup>2</sup> Kaibel, 156, 309, 316, 356, 357, 598, 683, 844, 850, 909.

not taken up here because, although their ultimate origin may be explained by a theory like that propounded by Usener, they do not, in themselves, display any deliberate plan of composition and, consequently, are repeated only by accident.<sup>1</sup>

To sum up, then, what seem to me to be the results of our investigation :

In the extant literature there is no such thing as the so-called 'dramatic pentameter.' These lines have every appearance of being pairs of dactylic tripodies catalectic, so constructed and known to be such by the poets themselves. The reappearance of these old-fashioned verses in Euripides is perhaps one of the marks of the influence of Aischylos upon him. The recognition of their real nature effectually disposes of some exceptional usage hitherto considered by some metricians under the head of the regular pentameter. In so far, then, the discussion of the regular pentameter has been considerably simplified. The pentameter clings closely to the hexameter. It is rarely found in the company of other verses, never unless chaperoned, so to speak, by the hexameter. The one exception is an epitaph of the Macedonian period which was plainly constructed *ad hoc* and in which the poet chose a verse as near the hexameter as the improper name of his subject would allow.

The pentameter as a monostich did not derive from a theory that the verse might be cut out of the distich and used by itself. It is due to an inevitable but false analogy with verses which it closely resembled and from which, in fact, the elegiac pentameter had originally sprung, the double dactylic tripody catalectic. It was not until it had usurped and thereby inherited the use of these verses in the contracted sphere in which they had moved from a remote antiquity that the right of the pentameter to be used as a monostich was established. It is impossible to say when this confusion took place. In fact it is a question whether it ever did altogether take place. The idea that these verses are really pentameters is more modern than ancient. At any rate, down to

<sup>1</sup> So, too, the combination of the distich with other verses was not taken up in this investigation, since no such combination may be called a form of the distich itself, either regular or irregular. Perhaps the most frequent and interesting of these combinations are those with the iambic trimeter. Compare, for example, Anthol. Pal. XIII 13; Simonides, 106 (Cr., p. 256); Krinagoras, Anthol. Pal. IX 239; Diog. Laert. IV 2, 12 (AP, VII 102); Greg. Naz. AP. VIII 85.

the very end of antiquity, the pentameter as a monostich has a definite and continuous tradition of artistic use. Not once in all that time does it occur outside its inherited sphere of *ex-votis*, proverbs, old said sooth and the like.

The pentameter *κατὰ στίχον* is also old. It may be due—though this is by no means as clear—to a similar false analogy and consequent usurpation of the tripod used in a series. This use of the tripod is rare. So is the pentameter *κατὰ στίχον*. But although the pentameter *κατὰ στίχον*—with special variations—rose to the height of literary use, it never held nor deserved the position of the single pentameter, and at the end of all things ran off and out into a so-called *πεντάμετρον ἐπικόν*. The one really artistic example of it is the epigram of Philippos (AP. 13, 1). That this should be a *dedicatio* in intent is also significant.

The deliberate reversal of the distich is associated with the name of Dionysios Chalkus, but apparently his experiment went no further than the merely mechanical interchange of hexameter and pentameter. He does not seem to have had the discernment even to realize that, for example, the system of pauses usual in the distich should have been reversed as well as the order of the lines if any notable effect was to be produced. It is probable that, like Yvon in the old fairy tale, "this trick never came out of his own head." We have one oracle of two lines in this form. If such were his source he misunderstood the evidence. The oracle regarding Phalaris, for example, if genuine is not a deliberate case of the distich reversed. Oracles are not delivered in distichs at all. Such cases as Apuleius, Met. IV 33, Heliod. Aethiop. II 26, II 35, are purely literary. Indeed the oracle regarding Phalaris may well be of the same sort, merely part of a story which certainly smacks of later days and was designed by its form to suggest the irregularities of ancient folk verse. The idea underlying the other forms discussed is clear enough.

In every case, irregular forms of the distich are either confined to, or clearly derived from, the inscriptional sphere. This is due to the extreme antiquity of the sphere, to the conservatism of tradition, the variety of talent necessarily found there and the shape and limitations of the object inscribed. In a large number of cases the form is the result of mere juxtaposition of favorite sentiments and is, therefore, irregular only in appearance. There were a great many examples of these irregular forms. The frequency of inscriptions, their intimate connection with every

phase of public and private life is one of the most characteristic features of the ancient world as compared with our own. In the time of Sulla, for example, many travellers and investigators had already collected and published them in large numbers. These collections are now lost but must be reckoned with by those who would study the sources of Pausanias, the Greek Anthology, etc.

To select a frequent and characteristic peculiarity and constitute it a canon of literary art within the department in which it was found seems an easy and natural step, especially for the Greeks, with whom literary traditions were conservative and genetic and the distinctive, inherited peculiarities of department so carefully observed. When the epigram developed from its original office of a practical *inscriptio* into a regular branch of literature it dropped all its irregularities as a matter of course. But the original department went on as before, and if the poet returned to it he recognized the freedom of form as a departmental peculiarity and adopted it while moving in that department. The artistic limitations of the freedom which he allowed himself are clearly marked by the examples which we have been considering. The irregular forms of the distich which rose to literary rank, one and all, have a certain symmetry and betray a deliberate theory of composition. This is why they were selected for literary purposes in distinction from the rest, and down to the latest period their original sphere was rarely, if ever, forgotten or transgressed.

Finally, when we contrast the Greek and Roman treatment of these forms the difference is characteristic and national. Rome speaks in the mouth of Petronius. With her imperious temper, her passion for the exact, the fact that with her the distich began as a scholastic tradition, not as a national growth, we should naturally expect her to relegate all infringements of the one proper form to the obscurity which, in her opinion, they deserved.

KIRBY FLOWER SMITH.